

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached nineteen replacement sheets of drawings are intended to replace all of the original drawing sheets. Applicant notes that original Figures 5, 5-1, 5-2, 5-3, and 6 of the drawings have been canceled without prejudice.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

In the Office action mailed on July 10, 2007, the restriction requirement was made final. Claims 3-7 were allowed (claims 8-19 remain withdrawn from consideration as a result of the restriction requirement). A substitute specification and replacement drawings were requested in view of objections to the specification and drawings.

Claims 3-7 are pending, and claims 8-19 were withdrawn from consideration. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the restriction requirement between Groups I, II and III. In the Office action, the Examiner asserted that the Group I claims merely recited “a shell” while the Group II claims recited “a shell forming a closed space,” such that the respective fields of search would be different. The Examiner further asserted that the step of “forming the shell around the rotor” in the method claims of Group III could be used to make a different product such as “a torque tube for superconductor motor.”

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims recite that the rotor is located within a shell, such that their respective fields of search for these “shell” claims would overlap. For example:

- Group I (claim 3) recites that “the rotor is located within the shell.”
- Group II (claim 8) also recites that “the rotor is located within the shell.”
- Group III (claim 14) recites the step of “forming a shell around the rotor.”

Applicant respectfully requests that the restriction requirement be withdrawn, and that claims 7 through 19 be allowed as well.

SUBSTITUTE SPECIFICATION

The specification was objected to, including the title of the invention and abstract, because the terms “mike 8001 design,” et al., allegedly were not descriptive.

In response to the objections raised in the Office action, Applicant hereby submits the attached substitute specification which includes no new matter. As required under 37 CFR 1.125, Applicant is submitting a marked-up version of the specification with markings to show all the changes relative to the immediate prior version (the original specification as amended in the amendment received by the Office on May 24, 2005); and a clean version of the substitute specification.

The terms “mike 8001 design,” et al., have been removed from the substitute specification. For example, the title has been amended from “The mike 8001 induction motor design” to “INDUCTION MOTOR HAVING THE ROTOR LOCATED WITHIN A SHELL.”

REPLACEMENT DRAWINGS

Applicant hereby submits the attached nineteen sheets of replacement drawings to address the objections raised in the Office action,. Applicant also notes that original Figures 5, 5-1, 5-2, 5-3, and 6 have been canceled. These canceled figures have been removed from the replacement drawings, the remaining figures have been renumbered,

and appropriate changes have been made to the specification (as reflected in the substitute specification being submitted herewith).

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that no fees are required in connection with this paper. Nonetheless, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required by this paper to Deposit Account No. 06-2425.

Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of the application at an early date. If the Examiner has any comments or questions regarding any of the foregoing, kindly telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
FULWIDER PATTON LLP

Date: September 10, 2007

By: /James Juo/
James Juo
Registration No. 36,177

Howard Hughes Center
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Telephone: (310) 824-5555
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696
Customer No. 24201